A is Uniqueness: Like individuals, preemptive force is prohibited for nations by imminence requirements in international law.

Shana Wallace. Beyond Imminence: Evolving International Law and Battered Women's Right to Self-Defense. 71 U. Chi. L. Rev. 1749 2004 “As in the…in international venues.”

As in the individual context, the requirements of self-defense in the international arena were set out with a specific scenario in mind. As codified by Article 51 of the UN Charter, one state will attack another, and once the "armed attack" is launched-or imminent-the attacked state can resort to its "inherent right of self-defense."76 Beyond recognizing that an "armed attack", is closely linked with the definition of "aggression,'8 standards of self-defense are not explicitly stated, as it is "universally acknowledged that the right of national defense is bounded by the same intrinsic limitations as the right of personal self-defense."79 The traditional requirements of necessity, imminence, and proportionality have been reaffirmed on multiple occasions in international venues."

B is the Link: The logic of the aff requires the expansion of imminence.

Wallace 2:

Furthermore, in both contexts the argument about anticipatory force centers on the requirement of imminence.'°' This requirement "distinguishes self-defense from the illegal use of force in two temporally related ways. A preemptive strike against a feared aggressor is illegal force used too soon; and retaliation against a successful aggressor is illegal force used too late."'' Thus, to prevent unnecessary recourse to self-help, "legitimate self-defense must be neither too soon nor too late.""' This temporal component of "imminence" has been singled out as the primary obstacle to both preemptive action by states and the self-defense claims of some battered women.'

Wallace 3:

The law of self-defense-in any context-is the legal authorization of the use of force to protect oneself from the unlawful aggression of another. Both domestic and international legal systems claim a monopoly on the use of force, where self-help is reserved to the individual or state only under very specific conditions. For example, while under U.S. domestic law it is unlawful for anyone to use force against another except in self-defense, in the international arena UN Article 2(4) prohibits "the threat or use of force,', and subsequently conditions Article 51(1)'s right of self-defense on the Security Council's not yet having "taken measures necessary to maintain international peace and security."'3 These common authorizations of self-defense are also circumscribed by the same requirements, as it is "universally acknowledged that the right of national defense is bounded by the same intrinsic limitations as the right of personal self-defense, namely, those of necessity, imminence, and proportionality."' A right to preemptive self-defense has traditionally not been included in the general right to self-defense in either context." That the requirements of self-defense are the same in both arenas is the product of the centuries-long practice of legal theorists using domestic law to develop a coherent doctrine of self-defense in international relations law.9 As Yoram Dinstein has observed: "The legal notion of self-defence has its roots in interpersonal relations, and has been sanctified in domestic legal systems since time immemorial. From the dawn of international law, writers sought to apply this concept to inter-State relations.'' " This conscious parallelism is justified by both principled and practical considerations. In principle, legal systems enact moral schemes that value life and thus set norms against aggression. To deter aggression, or punish it post hoc, requires assigning an entity responsibility for the aggression. In the international arena this necessitates the analogy between the state and the individual. For "[i]f states actually do possess rights more or less as individuals do, then it is possible to imagine a society among them more or less like the society of individuals."' This "comparison of international to civil order is crucial to the theory of aggression.

C is the Impact: Even the threat of preemptive force will increase international aggression.

Stanley:

The Consequences of Preemption. Ryan K. Stanley. Royal Military College of Canada “I Intend to…through non-violent means.”

I intend to show that the use of preemptive force is never strategically justified. Preemption is an inadequate long-term strategy because the cost of gaining an inconsistent strategic reputation through the use of preemptive force only increases the risk of attack and economic non-cooperation. An action is only strategically advantageous if the consequences of preemption result in a long-term profit for the attacking state. Preemption is the secret planning of attack prompted by either a perception of threat or a reaction to overt aggression intended to catch a competing actor by surprise. By using force when war is not inevitable, a preemptive state can gain a reputation for being reckless and unable to use non-violent means for conflict resolution. Attack not only guarantees immediate response but also potential negative consequences in the future. A state that has a history of using preemptive force as a strategy may be feared by others to use it in the future; other states may thus be tempted to use preemption as a way to counter future attacks. While preemption may be entirely justified, it only creates an unstable international system and a security anxiety that anyone might be secretly planning an attack. Preemptive force only increases the likelihood of aggression due to reciprocal fear of surprise attack. While the act of using preemptive force is justified in a narrow context against a state perceived to be determined for war, in a world of limited actors in multiple interactions and protracted long-term conflict, the use of preemptive force is neither strategically advantageous nor prudent; the consequences of preemption are greater than accepting the risk of being attacked first. A more effective long-term approach is to act through preventive defence and to encourage cooperation through open trade and constructive communication while employing a predictable and deterrent security policy. Proper use of communication and deterrence can overt the need to preempt a hostile state. Jervis (1976) points out that it is not inevitable that the hostility between two states must escalate to war. He describes two models were war between two states can be avoided if handled properly. First, the spiral model demonstrates that two states may act in response to the other’s militarization until the conflict escalates out of control. This occurred in WWI, when there was an arms race for the Dreadnought between Britain and Germany. Britain attempted to overcome the need to out-build one another by having each side announce its intentions and set the number of ships to be built at a reasonable level. Germany declined this proposal and Britain increased the problem by failing to reassure Germany of its own building plans. To counter the potential negative effects of escalation, intentions of peace must be communicated so that each state does not perceive the others’ actions as aggressive. The impetus to avoid war is placed on each state to justify its own actions as defensive and not aggressive. It should not be expected for either state to interpret the others’ actions as peaceful; it is the responsibility of each state to clearly communicate it own intentions for peace.The second model that Jervis highlights is the deterrence model in which a state does not communicate strongly enough its readiness to go to war if attacked by an aggressive state.[[1]](http://isme.tamu.edu/JSCOPE05/Stanley05.html" \l "_edn1) In the first Gulf War, had the United States communicated more clearly its intention to defend Kuwait if Iraq invaded, war may have been averted. Iraq would have better comprehended that invasion would bring serious consequences. An aggressive state views inaction to prepare for war as an aversion to go to war. This may lead an aggressive state to attack with the belief that there will be no serious consequences for their actions. The only time war is inevitable is when it is in the interest of both states to go to war due to the possible profits it may produce. In the Russo-Japanese War (1904-05), both sides had something to gain in going to war. In this case, neither state has any interest in averting preemption. Attacking provides a strategic advantage while being attacked offers legitimacy in fighting for the defence of the state. Unless it is in the interest of the state to go to war, violence can be avoided by communicating its intentions for peace as well as a willingness to defend itself if attacked. Preempting a hostile state not only results in the unwanted outcome of war, but also effects foreign relations in the long-term. The use of preemption gives a state a bad strategic reputation which affects future interactions with other states. Not only does a state that is preemptively attacked fear the use of similar tactics in the future, but also all other states that might become a target for attacks in the future. Interactions are not limited exclusively between two states, but are known by everyone with an interest in understanding future strategic relationships. Instead of decreasing security threats, preemption can actually increase security problems. O’Hanlon, Rice, and Steinberg (2002) point out that the use of preemption can actually create increased security problems by warning potential rivals to conceal weapons that might be targeted in preemption as well as drive states to develop weapons to deter attack.[[2]](http://isme.tamu.edu/JSCOPE05/Stanley05.html" \l "_edn2) States that do not accept part of the risk in negotiating peace and instead only attack in their own interest gain a reputation for aggressiveness, insecurity, and disinterest in attempting to solve conflict through non-violent means.

Increased risk of pre-emptive war will lead to nuclear war. Morgan 09

(Dennis Ray Morgan \* Hankuk University of Foreign Studies, Yongin Campus - South Korea, Elsevier, Futures 41 (2009) 683–693, “World on fire: two scenarios of the destruction of human civilization and possible extinction of the human race”) “Besides the accidental…attacks that nation.”

Besides the accidental factor, another factor that could incite nuclear war is that of aggression. When nuclear powers are involved in wars of aggression, the nuclear option is always available. Especially when a nuclear power explicitly states that ‘‘all options are on the table,’’ concern about the nuclear option is well founded. Thus, Moore defines the aggressive factor as when ‘‘one or more nations decide to use weapons against a nuclear or non-nuclear nation in order to promote an economic, political or military goal, as part of an ongoing war or as a first strike nuclear attack. (The state, of course, may claim it is a pre-emptive, retaliatory or even accidental attack.)’’ [10]. Especially in light of the recent U.S. attack on Iraq (ideologically based on Bush’s preventative war doctrine), the ‘‘pre-emptive’’ factor in instigating a nuclear war should be taken seriously. It is when one or more nations believe, whether correctly or incorrectly, or claims to believe ‘‘that another nuclear nation is about to use nuclear weapons against its nuclear, military, industrial or civilian targets and preemptively attacks that nation.’’ [10].6

Nuclear war leads to extinction. Paul Ehrlich et al find that: Paul R. Ehrlich, John Harte, Mark A. Harwell, Peter H. Raven, Carl Sagan, GeorgeM. Woodwell, Joseph Berry, Edward S. Ayensu, Anne H. Ehrlich, Thomas Eisner, Stephen J.Gould, Herbert D. Grover, Rafael Herrera, Robert M. May, Ernst Mayr, Christopher P.McKay, Harold A. Mooney, Norman Myers, David Pimentel, John M. Tea “Long-Term Biological Consequences of Nuclear War” Science, New Series, Vol. 222, No. 4630 (Dec. 23, 1983), pp. 1293-1300] “The prediction of…cannot be excluded.”

The prediction\* of climatic changes are quite robust (,4,5) so that quantalively the same- types of stresses would ensue from a limited war of 500 MT or less in which cities were targeted (S&t as from a larger scale nuclear war of 10,000 m : Essentially, all ecosystem support services would be severely impaired (Tables 2 and 3). We emphasize that survivors, at least in the Northern Hemisphere, would face extreme cold- water shortages, lack of food and fuel, heavy burdens of radiation and pollutants, [and] disease, and severe psychological stress all in twilight or darkness. The possibility exists that the darkened skies and low temperatures would spread over the entire planet {4, 5). Should this occur, a severe extinction event could ensue, leaving a highly modified and biologically depauperate Earth, Species extinction could be expected for most tropical plants and animal\*, and for most terrestrial vertebrates of north temperate regions, a large number of plants and numerous freshwater and sonic marine organisms. It seems unlikely\* however, that even in these circumstance\* homo sapiens would be forced to extinction immediately. Whether any people would be able to persist for long in the face of highly modified biological communities; novel climates; high levels of radiation: shattered agricultural, social, and economic systems; extraordinary psychological stresses; and a host of other difficulties is open to question. It is clear that the ecosystem effects atone resulting from a large-scale thermonuclear war could be enough to destroy the current civilization in at least the Northern Hemisphere. Coupled with the direct casualties of over I billion people, the combined intermediate and long-term effects of nuclear war suggest that eventually there might he no human survivors in the Northern Hemisphere. Furthermore\* the scenario described here is by no means the most severe that could be imagined with present world nuclear arsenals and those contemplated for the near future {4t 5). In any large-scale nuclear exchange between the superpowers, global environmental changes sufficient to cause the extinction of a major fraction of the plant and animal species on the Earth are likely, Jn that event\* the possibility of the extinction of homo sapiens cannot be excluded.